

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/832,750	CHELEHMAL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jamieson W. Fish	2616	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Jamieson W. Fish.

(3) _____

(2) William Cochran.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 April 2005

Time: 10:00 AM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

4 and 12

Prior art documents discussed:


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner wanted to confirm that claim 4 was intended to be dependent on claim 1 instead of canceled claim 3. The examiner also wanted to confirm that "said content provider" on line 4 of claim 12 was error. The attorney confirmed that claim 4 was indeed intended to be dependent on claim 1 and that "said content provider" should be replaced with "a video cable system provider." The following office action reflects these changes..